

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page(s)
I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY	1
II. ARGUMENT	1
1. OAH's and CDE's Arguments in their Oppositions Are Flawed	2
A. Status Quo	2
B. Civil Service Mandate	3
C. SEHO Is Irrelevant To this Action, Only OAH's Performance Is Relevant	5
D. OAH's Performance in Mediations Is Irrelevant	6
E. Plaintiff Has Already Exhausted Administrative Remedies	6
F. The United States Department of Education Should Intervene or Otherwise Act To Prevent the Ongoing Harm Caused by OAH and CDE	7
2. Irreparable Harm/Likelihood of Success on the Merits	9
III. CONCLUSION	12

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	Page(s)
<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	9
<i>Mills v. Board of Education, (DC, 1972)</i>	9
<i>Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) v. Pennsylvania (PA, 1971)</i>	9
<i>Tanner Motor Livery, Ltd. v. Avis, 316 F. 2d 804, 809 (9th Cir. 1963)</i>	3
<i>United States v. Nutri-cology, Inc. 982 F. 2d 394, 398 (9th Cir. 1992)</i>	10
<i>Van Duyn ex rel. Van Duyn v. Baker School Dist. 5J, 502 F. 3d 811,817-18 (9th Cir. 2007)</i>	10
STATUTES	Page(s)
California Education Code § 56501.5(d)	4
United States Code, Title 20, § 1415 (g)(2)	7
United States Code, Title 20, § 1416 (a)(3)(b)	4
34 C.F.R. § 300.511(a) and (c)	7
34 C.F.R. § 300.511(c)	4, 8
34 C.F.R. § 300.515(a) and (c)	4